

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,803	10/17/2005	Gordon Bruton	PB60227USw	5988
23347 11/08/2008 GLAXOSMITHKLINE CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B482			EXAMINER	
			COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY	
FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM LAURA.M.MCCULLEN@GSK.COM JULIE.D.MCFALLS@GSK.COM

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/553,803 BRUTON ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Brenda L. Coleman 1624 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-23.27 and 29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-23,27 and 29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/17/05 & 9/5/07.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/553,803

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-23, 27 and 29 are pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

 Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on July 25, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 1. Claims 1-23, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for other forms, does not reasonably provide enablement for solvates. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claim is drawn to solvates. But the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity".
- Claims 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

Art Unit: 1624

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The scope of "neurological disease" cannot be deemed enabled. The term "neurological desease" covers a broad array of different disorders that have different modes of action and different origins. The term covers such diverse disorders as Alzheimer's Disease: Parkinson's Disease: ALS and variants such as forms of ALS-PDC; Gerstmann-Straussler-Scheinker Disease (GSS); Pick's Disease: Diffuse Lewy Body Disease: Hallervordon-Spatz disease: progressive familiar myoclonic epilepsy; Corticodentatonigral degeneration; progressive supranuclear palsy (Steele-Richardson-Olszewski); Huntington's disease; more than a dozen dementias collectively called "frontotemporal dementia and Parkinsonism linked to chromosome 17" (FTDP-17); Tourette's syndrome; Shy-Drager syndrome; Friedrich's ataxia and other spinocerebellar degenerations: Olivopontocerebellar atrophy (OPCA); spasmotic torticollis; Striatonigral degeneration; various types of torsion dystonia; certain spinal muscular atrophies, such as Werdnig-Hoffmann and Wohlfart-Kugelberg-Welander; Hereditary spastic paraplegia, Primary lateral sclerosis; peroneal muscular atrophy (Charcot-Marie-Tooth); Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease (CJD); Hypertrophic interstitial polyneuropathy (Dejerine-Sottas); retinitis pigmentosa; Leber's Disease; and Hypertrophic interstitial polyneuropathy. These exhibit a very broad range of effects and origins. For example, some give progressive dementia without other prominent neurological signs, such as Alzheimer's disease, whereas other dementias have such

Art Unit: 1624

signs, such as Diffuse Lewy Body Disease. Some give muscular wasting without sensory changes, e.g. ALS, and some do have the sensory changes such as Werdnig-Hoffmann. Some are abnormalities of posture, movement or speech, such as Striatoniaral degeneration, and other are progressive ataxias, such as OPCA. Some are linked to tau mutations, such as Alzheimer's disease and FTDP-17, and other such as Parkinson's clearly do not. Some affect only vision such as retinitis pigmentosa. Even within those that fall into the same category of effects, there are often striking differences. For example, Alzheimer's disease and Pick's disease both give progressive dementia without other prominent neurological signs. But the characteristic Alzheimer's neurofibrillary tangles are not seen in Pick's Disease, which has straight fibrils, as opposed to the paired helical filaments of Alzheimer's disease. Pick's Disease gives lobal atrophy, not seen in Alzheimer's disease. There are differences in origins, even with what little is known. Thus, among progressive dementias, CJD is definitely caused by an infectious agent; so far as can be determined, this is not so for Huntington's disease. Even among the hereditary disorders, the origins are different. Thus, FTDP-17 comes from chromosome 17, Huntington's disease from 4, and the neurodegenerative disorder that people with Down's syndrome develop later in life is presumably connected in some way to 21.

The great majority of these have no treatment at all, and of those that do, none or virtually none have been treated with such inhibitors as are disclosed here. The great diversity of diseases falling within the "neurological desease" category means that it is contrary to medical understanding that any agent (let alone a genus of trillions of

Art Unit: 1624

compounds) could be generally effective against such diseases. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task. Further, what little success there has been does not point in this direction. Thus, what very few treatments that the massive research effort on Alzheimer's disease has produced are means of providing Acetylcholinesterase inhibition, unrelated to the mechanism of action in this case.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly

claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- Claims 2, 10, 19 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:
 - a. Claim 2 recites the limitation "heterocyclyl" in the definition of R¹. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
 - b. Claim 10 is vague and indefinite in that it is not further limiting.
 - Claim 19 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by E1-E198.
 - d. Regarding claim 29, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda L. Coleman whose telephone number is 571-272-0665. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brenda L. Coleman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624